



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/306,038	05/06/1999	CLARENCE C. RUDD	RCA88959	2948

7590

06/07/2002

JOSEPH S TRIPOLI  
THOMSON MULTIMEDIA LINCENSING INC  
PO BOX 5312  
PRINCETON, NJ 085435312

EXAMINER

TRAN, QUOC DUC

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2643

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/306,038

Applicant(s)  
Rudd et al

Examiner  
Quoc D. Tran

Art Unit  
2643



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 7, 2002

2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application

4a) Of the above, claim(s) 1-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration

5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-14 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirements.

## Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2643

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Han (5,991,397) in view of Turnbull et al (6,088,362) and further in view of Heep et al (4,996,709).

Consider claim 11, Han teaches a multi line telephone system for providing paging feature comprising a first telephone for selecting a group of telephone in the system (col. 1 lines 20-22, and col. 6 lines 46-49); a first telephone initiate a voice message to the group of telephone; and the group of telephones receives and play the voice message from the first telephone automatically regardless of user action and wherein anyone of said group of telephones after hearing said voice message can initiate a two way conversation with the user of the first telephone (col. 7 lines 2-9).

It should be noted that Han is directed to the switching system. Thus it is not a KSU system. Therefore, Han did not clearly suggest wherein the system is a KSU-less system. However, Turnbull et al suggest a KSU-less system providing intercom feature (col. 1 lines 45-55).

Art Unit: 2643

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Turnbull et al into view of Han in order to provide subscribers with accessible system-type features that enhance customer services.

Furthermore Han and Turnbull et al did not suggest a half-duplex channel for communication. However, Heep et al teach an intercom system where communication can be established in half-duplex or full-duplex mode (col. 1 lines 53-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Heep et al into view Han in order to provide different modes of communication.

Consider claim 12, Turnbull et al teach the system wherein at least one of the group telephones comprising a display for providing an identification number of the first telephone (Fig. 2).

Consider claim 13, Han teaches a timer for setting a predetermined period for the one-way communication response (see col. 5 line 52-63). Han did not suggest wherein the voice message is automatically terminated at a predetermined period. However, it is obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to acknowledge that when the predetermined time has expired, the communication is automatically terminated. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the step of terminating the communication when the paging telephone is on-hook in order to end the communications session.

Art Unit: 2643

Consider claim 14, Han teaches the system wherein the two-way communication is initiated by being in an off-hook mode (col. 7 lines 5-9).

***Conclusion***

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Any response to this action should be mailed to:  
*Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks*  
*Washington, D.C. 20231*  
*or faxed to:*  
**(703) 872-9314**


*Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Quoc Tran** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5643**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 to 6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Curtis Kuntz**, can be reached on **(703) 305-4708**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 whose telephone number is **(703) 306-0377**.

May 31, 2002

  
**CURTIS KUNTZ**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**